

MASS.
EL1.8:
988-994

UMASS/AMHERST



312066016267647



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Elder Affairs
One Ashburton Place, Boston, MA 02108

WILLIAM F. WELD
GOVERNOR

ARGEO PAUL CELLUCCI
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

FRANKLIN P. OLLIVIERRE
SECRETARY

INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

EOEA-IM-95-31

To: Home Care Corporations/Area Agencies on Aging

From: Franklin P. Ollivierre

Frank P. Ollivierre

Date: September 15, 1995

Re: FY94 Annual Statistical Report

Enclosed please find the Annual Statistical Reports for Fiscal Year 1994. If you have any questions, please contact with Wey Hsiao (617) 727-7750.

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS
COLLECTION

FEB 26 1996

University of Massachusetts
Jepson

CASELOAD

On June 30, 1994, the last day of fiscal year 1994, Massachusetts' twenty-seven Home Care Corporations provided Home Care services for 30,756 clients, Respite Care services for 1,411 clients, Enhanced Community Option Program services for 957 clients, Managed Care in Housing services for 904 clients, and Protective Services for 668 clients.

The majority of the clients were served by only one program. Some elders were served by more than one program. (See Table 1.) Counting those who enrolled in more than one program only once, Home Care Corporations served 34,209 clients in FY94, 439 clients less than the number of unduplicated clients served in FY93.

Table 1: Clients by Program, FY94	
Home Care Clients	30,756
Home Care + Respite Care	224
Home Care + Protective Service	209
Respite Care Clients	1,411
Respite Care Only	1,187
Respite Care + Protective Service	36
Managed Care in Housing Clients	904
Managed Care + Protective Service	3
Enhanced Community Option Clients	957
ECOP + Protective Service	15
Protective Service Clients	668
Protective Service Only	405
Total, Unduplicated End-of-Year Count*	34,209

Caseload Trend

The number of unduplicated "end-of-year" clients showed an 1.3% decrease from FY93 to FY94. The change in the number of clients varied by program: (See Table 2)

* End-of-year count is a manual count conducted on June 30, 1994. Since it is based on a one-day snapshot and all the records in the client database had been checked and updated, end-of-year count is different from monthly count for June.

Caseload Trend (continued)

A. Home Care (HC) Program:

The "end-of-year" count of Home Care Program clients showed a decrease from 31,368 in FY93 to 30,756 in FY94, a 2.0% decrease. From July 1993 to June 1994, Home Care Program clients decreased from 31,644 to 30,893, a 2.4% decline.

B. Respite Care (RC) Program:

The "end-of-year" count of Respite Care clients increased from 1,339 in FY93 to 1,411 in FY94, a 5.4% increase. Clients who received only Respite Care increased 24.3%, while Respite/Home Care clients decreased 38.0%.

From July 1993 to June 1994, Respite Care clients increased from 1,296 to 1,430, a 10.3% increase. Clients receiving both Home Care and Respite Care services decreased from 338 in July 1993 to 246 in June 1994, a 27.2% decrease. Clients receiving only Respite Care increased from 958 in July 1993 to 1,184 in June 1994, a 23.6% increase.

C. Managed Care in Housing (MCIH) Program:

The "end-of-year" count of Managed Care in Housing Program clients decreased from 933 in FY93 to 904 in FY94, a 3.1% decrease. From July 1993 to June 1994, Managed Care in Housing clients decreased from 924 to 906, a 2.0% decrease.

Table 2: Number of Clients, 7/93 - 6/94						
	HC	RC All	RC Only	MCIH	ECOP	Total*
July 1993	31,281	1,322	997	931	979	34,188
August 1993	31,340	1,358	1,028	925	958	34,251
September 1993	31,281	1,371	1,051	925	954	34,211
October 1993	31,288	1,396	1,076	926	875	34,165
November 1993	31,225	1,395	1,082	914	874	34,095
December 1993	31,094	1,362	1,079	919	902	33,994
January 1994	31,110	1,350	1,081	901	908	34,000
February 1994	30,923	1,343	1,070	899	926	33,818
March 1994	30,821	1,378	1,109	893	939	33,762
April 1994	30,791	1,387	1,136	890	943	33,760
May 1994	30,805	1,388	1,148	881	991	33,825
June 1994	30,893	1,430	1,184	906	914	33,897
Average, FY94	31,071	1,373	1,087	909	930	33,997
* Total = HC + RC only + MCIH + ECOP						
Sources: Monthly Home Care Statistics, Respite Care Statistics, Managed Care in Housing Statistics, Enhanced Community Option Program Statistics.						

Caseload Trend (continued)

D. Enhanced Community Option Program (ECOP):

The "end-of-year" count of Enhanced Community Option Program clients did not show much change from FY93 to FY94. From July 1993 to June 1994, Enhanced Community Option Program clients slightly increased from 943 to 980, a 3.9 increase.

E. Protective Service (PS) Program

The "end-of-year" count of Protective Service clients increased from 641 in FY93 to 658 in FY94, a 2.7% increase.

Age Profile

The average age of all the unduplicated clients was 80.8. The average age of Home Care Program clients, Respite Care Only clients, Managed Care in Housing clients, Enhanced Community Option Program clients, and Protective Service clients was 80.8, 79.2, 84.0, 82.2, and 78.2, respectively. MCIH clients were about three years older than Home Care Program clients. ECOP clients were about two years older than Home Care Program clients and one year younger than MCIH clients. Respite Care Only clients were about one and a half years younger than Home Care Program clients. Protective Service clients were about two and half years younger than Home Care Program clients.

Compared to the age structure of Home Care Program clients based on records on the last day of the past seven fiscal years, the average age increased from 79.8 in FY87 to 80.8 in FY94. (See Table 3 for age distribution)

Sex

Women comprised 80.5% of unduplicated clients and men comprised the rest, 19.5%. Home Care program had a higher percent of female clients (81.9%). Respite Care program had a higher percent of male clients (45.0%). (See Table 3 for the percentage of female clients by program) Male clients were younger than female in almost all the programs except Protective Service Program. (See Table 4 for the average age by sex by program.)

Compared to the sex composition of the last seven years, the percentage of female home care clients remained stable. About four-fifths of home care clients were female.

Sex (continued)

Table 3: Clients by Age and Sex from FY87 to FY94*

	<u># Clients</u>	<u>% Female</u>	<u>% 60-74</u>	<u>% 75-84</u>	<u>% 85+</u>
FY94					
All**	34,209	80.5%	24.8%	42.2%	33.0%
HC	30,756	81.9	24.9	42.2	32.8
RC	1,411	55.0	29.8	44.0	26.2
RC only	1,187	52.4	30.8	44.9	24.3
MC	904	80.5	24.8	42.2	33.0
ECOP	957	74.8	18.5	40.5	41.0
PS	688	75.4	35.6	41.4	22.9
PS only	405	72.3	39.0	41.2	19.8
FY93					
All**	34,648	81.0%	25.4%	42.5%	32.1%
HC	31,368	82.1	25.4	42.7	32.0
RC	1,339	55.5	32.3	42.0	24.7
RC only	978	52.6	35.6	42.9	21.5
MC	933	81.0	14.7	38.3	47.1
ECOP	956	75.6	18.9	42.7	38.4
PS	641	75.4	41.0	39.5	19.5
PS only	413	74.1	46.3	37.5	16.2
FY92					
All**	35,101	81.2%	26.3%	43.3%	30.5%
HC	32,845	82.2	25.9	43.4	30.7
RC only	962	51.1	38.0	42.7	19.3
MC	881	79.9	15.3	42.9	41.9
PS only	620	75.2	43.3	38.7	18.0
FY91					
HC	32,706	82.4	25.4	43.7	30.9
FY90					
HC	38,154	81.9	26.3	44.4	29.3
FY89					
HC	41,083	81.4	27.2	44.6	28.2
FY88					
HC	44,291	80.9	27.7	44.7	27.7
FY87					
HC	44,379	80.8	28.9	43.7	27.6

* End-of-year count.

** All: all unduplicated clients; HC: Home Care Program clients; RC: Respite Care clients; MC: Managed Care clients; ECOP: ECOP clients; PS: Protective Service clients.

Sex (continued).

Table 4: Average Age by Sex by program, FY94*		
	Male	Female
A. Home Care Program	79.3	81.1
B. Respite Care Program	78.9	80.2
Respite Care Only	78.8	79.5
Respite Care/Home Care	79.3	81.1
C. Enhanced Community Option Program	81.3	83.2
D. Managed Care in Housing	82.2	84.4
E. Protective Service	78.7	78.1
Protective Service Only	78.2	77.2
* All unduplicated clients (End-of-year count)	79.4	81.2

Matrix and Functional Impairment Level (FIL)

Massachusetts Home Care Corporations serve frail and impaired elders. Table 5 lists the percentage of clients with critical unmet needs and the distribution of functional impairment level by program. It indicates that more than 88% of clients fell into the frailer categories (FIL I - III). About seven-eighths of Home Care Program Clients had critical unmet needs. More than 95% of ECOP and MCIH clients had critical unmet needs.

ECOP clients were frailer than Home Care Program and Managed Care in Housing Program clients. About two-fifths (38.6%) of ECOP clients were FIL I clients with critical unmet needs (compared to 5.5% in Home Care Program and 11.5% in MCIH Program). Managed Care in Housing Program served a higher percentage of FIL II clients with critical unmet needs (58.2%). Home Care Program served a higher percentage of FIL III clients with critical unmet needs (47.0%).

Respite Care clients were the most frail among all the programs. More than half of the Respite Care clients were FIL I with a caregiver. Based on Respite Care Monthly statistics, 16.2% of respite care clients had Alzheimer's disease. On the average, the Respite Care Program served 223 clients with Alzheimer's disease per month.

From FY92 to FY94, the proportion of all FIL I-III clients increased from 82.4% to 89.0%. The proportion of FIL I-III Home Care clients increased from 81.6% to 88.0%.

Compared to the distribution of functional impairment level of the last seven years, the proportion of FIL I-III Home Care clients increased from 59.3% in FY87 to 88.0% in FY94. (See Table 6)

Matrix, Age, and Sex

Home Care Program Clients age 85 and over were frailer. Eighty-one percent (81.3%) of Home Care Program clients age 85 and over were FIL I-III with critical unmet needs, compared to 77.4% of the FIL I-III clients age 75-84 and 77.9% of the FIL I-III clients age 60-74. However, ECOP and MCIH clients age 85 and over were less frail than the clients of other age groups. Thirty-five percent (35.0%) of ECOP clients age 85 and over were FIL I with critical unmet needs compared to 40.5% of the FIL I clients age 75-84 and 42.4% of the FIL I clients age 60-74. Ten percent (10.1%) of MCIH clients age 85 and over were FIL I with critical unmet needs compared to 10.4% of the FIL I clients age 75-84 and 20.4% of the FIL I clients age 60-74.

There was no major difference in the percentage of FIL I-III clients with critical unmet needs between male and female clients in each age group in Home Care Program, Respite Care Program, Managed Care in Housing Program, and Enhanced Community Option Program. However, male Home Care Program clients age 75 and over were more likely to be FIL I with critical unmet needs than female Home Care Program clients age 75 and over (7.4% vs 5.2%). Female ECOP clients were more likely to be FIL I with critical unmet needs than male clients (39.1% vs 33.2%). Male ECOP clients were more likely to be FIL I-II with critical unmet needs than female clients (76.7% vs 68.0%). (For a detailed breakdown by age, sex, and Matrix/FIL, please see Appendix I.)

Table 5: Matrix in FY94

	<u>FIL I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>Total</u>
A. Home Care Program					
Critical	5.5%	26.4%	47.0%	8.4%	87.2%
Non-Critical	0.6	2.2	6.5	3.5	12.7
Total	6.1	28.6	53.5	11.9	100.0
B. Respite Care	51.9	33.0	14.7	0.2	100.0
Respite Care Only	50.7	33.5	15.4	0.2	100.0
Respite/Home Care	58.5	30.4	10.7	0.5	100.0
C. ECOP					
Critical	38.6	42.1	15.3	0.8	96.8
Non-Critical	-	-	-	-	3.2
D. Managed Care in Housing					
Critical	11.5	58.2	29.2	0.1	99.0
Non-Critical	-	-	-	-	1.0
E. Total (HC + RC only + ECOP + MCIH)	8.7	29.9	50.4	10.9	99.8

* End-of-year count.

Table 6: FIL Status from FY87 to FY94*

FY94	% FIL	I	II	III	III	IV	SSN@	Total
ALL**	8.7%		29.9%	50.4%	10.9%	-	0.3%	100.0%
HC	6.1		28.6	53.5	11.9	-	0.1	100.0
RC	51.9		33.0	14.7	0.2	-	0.0	100.0
RC only	50.7		33.5	15.4	0.2	-	0.0	100.0
Matrix	<u>1C</u>		<u>2C</u>	<u>3C</u>	<u>4C</u>		<u>NC</u>	
HC	5.5		26.4	47.0	8.4	-	12.7	100.0
MC	11.5		58.2	29.2	0.1	-	1.0	100.0
ECOP	38.6		42.1	15.3	0.8	-	3.2	100.0
FY93								
ALL**	9.2%		28.0%	49.5%	13.3%	-	0.1%	100.0%
HC	6.8		26.4	52.3	14.4	-	0.1	100.0
RC	54.7		32.1	12.9	0.3	-	0.0	100.0
RC only	52.8		33.0	13.8	0.4	-	0.0	100.0
Matrix	<u>1C</u>		<u>2C</u>	<u>3C</u>	<u>4C</u>		<u>NC</u>	
HC	6.1		24.0	43.3	10.4	-	16.1	100.0
MC	10.7		58.0	28.8	0.9	-	1.6	100.0
ECOP	33.2		45.8	15.7	0.4	-	4.9	100.0
FY92								
ALL**	7.8		24.7	49.9	17.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
HC	6.5		23.9	51.2	18.4	0.1	0.0	100.0
RC	53.3		33.2	13.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
MC	8.5		47.0	42.8	1.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
FY91								
HC	6.1		22.8	52.0	18.9	0.1	0.1	100.0
FY90								
HC	5.6		19.3	50.1	22.4	2.3	0.3	100.0
FY89								
HC	5.8		16.8	48.5	25.1	3.4	0.4	100.0
FY88								
HC	5.7		14.6	46.8	27.7	4.7	0.4	100.0
FY87								
HC	5.7		13.3	40.3	32.9	7.5	0.3	100.0

C: Critical, 1C: Matrix 1, 2C: Matrix 2.. NC: Non-critical.

* End-of-year count.

** Including HC, RC only, MC, and ECOP clients.

@ Special Service Needs or Exceptions

Medicaid: Home Care Program Clients

Medicaid recipients comprised 36.4% of the Home Care Program clients, down 1.0% from FY93. Among them, 24.2% were on the Medicaid Home and Community Based Waiver Services Program (2176), up 2.0% from FY93. Among those on 2176 Waiver, 17.3% were Spousal Waiver clients. (See Table 7)

Medicaid clients became frailer. The proportion of Medicaid clients who belong to FIL I to III increased from 85.4% in July 1993 to 88.0% in June 1994. (Source: Monthly Home Care Statistics)

Table 7: Medicaid Home Care Clients By Type*

	Spousal Waiver		2176 Waiver		Non-Waiver		Medicaid Clients	Medicaid Clients
	(A)	(A) / (B)	(B)	(B) / (D)	(C)	(C) / (D)	(D)	%
FY94	470	(17.3%)	2712	(24.2%)	8,277	(75.8%)	11,186	36.4%
FY93	248	(9.5%)	2604	(22.2%)	9,125	(77.8%)	11,729	37.4%
FY92	398	(17.3%)	2298	(19.0%)	9,793	(81.0%)	12,096	36.8%
FY91	225	(8.0%)	2809	(23.0%)	9,423	(77.0%)	12,232	37.4%
FY90	225	(6.7%)	3379	(23.9%)	10,766	(76.1%)	14,145	37.1%
FY89	456	(13.2%)	3460*	(23.6%)	11,199	(76.4%)	14,659	31.3%
FY88	154	(9.5%)	1625*	(11.7%)	12,231	(88.3%)	13,856	35.7%

* End-of-year count.

Marital Status

Table 8 lists the marital status by program. About two-thirds of Home Care Program clients were widowed. About 70% of respite care clients were married. ECOP and MCIH programs had a higher percentage of widows.

The Home Care Program had a higher percentage of unmarried clients (including single, widows, divorced and separated) than other programs. Respite Care program had the highest percentage of married clients. The Enhanced Community Option Program had a higher percentage of married clients than the Home Care and MCIH programs.

The percentage of married Home Care Program clients decreased from 15.7% in FY87 to 13.2% in FY94. The percentage of single and divorced clients gradually increased. (See Table 9) (For a detailed breakdown by marital status, please see Appendix II.)

Marital Status (Continued)

Table 8: Marital Status by program, FY94*

	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Widowed</u>	<u>Divorced</u>	<u>Separated</u>
A. Home Care Program	12.2%	13.2%	64.8%	7.6%	2.3%
B. Respite Care Program	4.7	69.7	23.4	1.6	0.6
Respite Care Only	4.6	74.2	19.4	1.4	0.4
Respite/Home Care	5.4	56.0	44.6	2.2	1.8
C. Enhanced Community Option Program	9.7	22.2	64.5	3.0	0.6
D. Managed Care in Housing	13.3	9.3	71.8	4.7	1.0

* End-of-year count.

Table 9: Marital Status of Home Care Program Clients*

<u>Status</u>	<u>Percentage</u>							
	<u>FY94</u>	<u>FY93</u>	<u>FY92</u>	<u>FY91</u>	<u>FY90</u>	<u>FY89</u>	<u>FY88</u>	<u>FY87</u>
Widowed	64.8	65.1	63.8	65.7	66.2	65.8	65.9	66.6
Married	13.2	14.2	16.0	14.1	14.7	15.7	16.7	15.7
Single	12.2	11.7	11.5	11.5	11.1	11.1	10.7	11.3
Divorced	7.6	6.9	6.6	6.5	6.1	5.6	5.2	4.9
Separated	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.2	1.9	1.7	1.5	1.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

* End-of-year count.

Living Arrangement

Table 10 lists living arrangement by program. About three-fourths of Home Care Program clients (77.2%) lived alone. The remaining 22.8% lived with someone. Among them, 10.7% lived with their spouse only; 0.9% with spouse and other family member/s; 9.6% with family member/s; and 1.5% with people outside of the family.

About two-thirds (65.9%) of Respite Care Program clients lived with their spouse. Only a few lived alone (3.8%). On the contrary, most MCIH clients lived alone (87.6%). ECOP had a higher percentage of clients lived with spouse and/or family than Home Care Program and MCIH Program. This may be because ECOP clients were frailer. (For a detailed breakdown by living arrangement, please see Appendix II.)

Living Arrangement (Continued)

From FY87 to FY94, the percentage of Home Care Program Clients living alone had gradually increased. Those who lived with spouse and/or family had decreased.. (See Table 11)

Table 10: Living Arrangement by Program, FY94*

	Alone	Spouse	Spouse/ Family	Family	Non- Family
A. Home Care Program	77.2%	10.7%	1.0%	9.6%	1.5%
B. Respite Care Program	3.8	65.9	5.2	23.7	1.3
Respite Care Only	2.1	70.5	5.3	20.8	1.1
Respite/Home Care	12.5	41.5	4.5	39.3	2.3
C. Enhanced Community Option Program	53.0	18.5	1.9	24.5	2.0
D. Managed Care in Housing	87.6	7.7	0.0	2.8	1.7

* End-of-year count.

Table 11: Living Arrangement - Home Care Program Clients

Living Arrangement	Percentage							
	FY94	FY93	FY92	FY91	FY90	FY89	FY88	FY87
Alone	77.2	76.4	74.0	76.0	75.1	73.7	72.5	73.4
With Spouse	10.7	11.4	13.4	12.0	12.5	13.8	14.5	13.4
Spouse + Family	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Family	9.6	9.8	10.0	9.6	9.9	9.9	10.7	10.5
Family/Non-Family	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2
Non-Family	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.1

* End-of-year count.

Minority Status

In FY94, 7.7% of all clients were from minority groups, up 0.5% from FY93. Among them, 66.1% were Blacks, 18.9% Hispanics, 10.2% Asians, 3.8% Cape Verdean, and 1.0% Native American. The percentage of minority clients increased since FY90.

Table 12 lists the percentage of minority clients and the composition of minority clients by program. The Home Care Program served a higher percentage of minority clients (8.0%) than other programs. Managed Care in Housing Program and Enhanced Community Option Program served a very low percentage of minority clients (2.8% and 3.3%, respectively). According to 1990 census, 4.7% of the population age 60 and over were minority elders. (For a detailed breakdown by minority groups, please see Appendix II.)

Minority Status (Continued)

Table 12: Minority Clients by Program, FY94*

	Cape Verdean	Black	Hispanic	Native American	Asian	% Minority
A. Home Care	3.8%	65.3%	19.4%	1.0%	10.6%	8.0%
B. Respite Care	3.9	80.8	12.8	1.3	1.3	5.5
RC Only	2.2	80.4	13.0	2.2	2.2	3.9
RC/HC	6.3	81.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	14.3
C. ECOP	3.1	78.1	6.3	0.0	12.5	3.3
D. MCIH	4.0	88.0	4.0	4.8	0.0	2.8

* End-of-year count.

Physical Environment

Table 13 lists housing environment by program. Twenty-eight percent of Home Care Program clients lived in buildings managed by a local Housing Authority. Twenty-Four percent of Home Care Program clients owned their own home. About 19% lived in subsidized buildings not managed by a Housing Authority. Most Respite Care clients (86.1%) lived in private housing. More than half of the Respite Care clients (56.9%) owned their own home. About three-fourths (77.2%) of Enhanced Community Option Program (ECOP) clients lived in private housing. About a half of ECOP clients (47.0%) owned their own home. Most Managed Care in Housing (MCIH) clients (92.6%) lived in public housing. About fourth-fifths (79.6%) of MCIH clients lived in buildings managed by Housing Authority or in other subsidized buildings. (For detailed Housing Type by Matrix/FIL information please see Appendix III)

There was no difference in the percentage of clients with critical unmet needs between private housing clients and public housing clients in the Home Care Program, Managed Care in Housing Program, and Enhanced Community Option program. For example, 87.5% of the Home Care Program clients living in private housing had critical unmet needs compared to 87.0% of the clients living in public housing.

In terms of housing types, there was not much change in the last seven fiscal years. (See Table 14)

Physical Environment (Continued)

Table 13: Housing Environment by Program*

Type of Housing	Percentage		ECOP	MCIH	All
	Home Care	Respite Care			
Private Housing					
Own Home	23.6	56.9	47.0	4.3	23.8
Private House	8.2	17.2	18.0	1.6	8.3
Rental Hse/Apt	10.5	11.7	11.5	1.2	10.3
Boarding Home	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.3
Rooming House	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hotel/Single Room	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other Private	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.3
Public Housing					
Housing Authority	28.4	3.9	9.0	45.7	28.3
Other Subs Bldg	18.9	6.5	8.5	33.9	19.0
Rent Subs (Priv)	8.0	3.1	4.5	7.9	7.9
Congregate Subs	1.4	0.0	0.7	5.0	1.5
Other Subsidized	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 14: Housing Types of Home Care Program Clients*

Type of Housing	Percentage							
	FY94	FY93	FY92	FY91	FY90	FY89	FY88	FY87
Private Housing	42.9	43.5	43.3	41.0	41.1	42.9	44.5	43.9
Own Home	23.6	24.0	24.1	22.8	23.2	23.6	23.7	22.5
Rental Hse/Apt	10.5	11.1	11.0	10.9	11.3	11.7	13.0	13.2
Boarding Home	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	2.0	0.1	0.1
Rooming House	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Hotel/Single Room	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Private Home/other	8.5	8.1	7.9	7.1	6.4	5.6	7.6	8.0
Public Housing	57.1	56.5	56.7	59.0	58.9	57.1	55.5	56.1
Housing Authority	28.4	28.7	29.3	31.6	32.4	32.6	31.8	32.7
Other Subs Bldg	18.9	18.6	18.4	18.2	16.1	16.0	15.0	14.5
Rent Subs (Priv)	8.0	7.9	7.6	7.7	8.3	7.1	7.4	7.4
Congregate Subs	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.2	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.4
Other Subsidized	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9	1.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
* End-of-year count.								

Income

Eighty-nine percent of the Home Care Program clients (89.3%) lived in single households. The remaining 10.7% lived in two or more person households. In the single households, 37.4% were Medicaid clients; 9.2% had incomes lower than \$7,232 but did not meet resource requirements to qualify for Medicaid. About one-fifth (18.1%) had incomes higher than \$7,232 but lower than \$8,821; 17.1% fell between \$8,822 and \$10,410; 10.4% fell between \$10,411 and \$12,319; and 7.9% had incomes greater than \$12,320 a year or \$1,000 a month.

In the two or more person households, 26.7% of Home Care Program clients were on Medicaid. About 8.5% had incomes lower than \$9,695 but did not receive Medicaid; 9.8% had incomes lower than \$12,160 but higher than \$9,695; 19.1% had incomes higher than \$12,161 but lower than \$14,612; 8.3% had incomes higher than \$14,613 but lower than \$15,850; and 27.5% had incomes higher than \$15,851.

Among ECOP clients living in single households, 11.1% had incomes lower than \$7,232; 26.2% had incomes higher than \$7,232 but lower than \$8,821; 26.1% fell between \$8,822 and \$10,410; 12.5% fell between \$10,411 and \$12,319; and 24.1% had incomes greater than \$12,320 a year.

Among ECOP clients living in two or more persons households, 8.4% had incomes lower than \$9,695; 6.4% had incomes lower than \$12,160 but higher than \$9,695; 17.8% had incomes higher than \$12,161 but lower than \$14,612; and 16.3% had incomes higher than \$14,613 but lower than \$15,850; and 42.6% had incomes higher than \$15,851.

Among MCIH clients living in single households, 13.7% had incomes lower than \$7,232; 29.1% had incomes higher than \$7,232 but lower than \$8,821; 32.0% fell between \$8,822 and \$10,410; 10.1% fell between \$10,411 and \$12,319; and 15.1% had incomes greater than \$12,320 a year.

Among ECOP clients living in two or more persons households, 4.3% had incomes lower than \$9,695; 14.3% had incomes lower than \$12,160 but higher than \$9,695; 32.9% had incomes higher than \$12,161 but lower than \$14,612; and 12.9% had incomes higher than \$14,613 but lower than \$15,850; and 35.7% had incomes higher than \$15,851. (For detailed income by program information please see Appendix IV.)

Most Respite Care clients were living in two-person financial units (94.3%). Others (5.7%) lived in three or four person financial units. About one-fourth (23.3%) of Respite Care only clients paid 3% of their service cost; 27.0% paid 5-13%; 21.3% paid 15-27%; and 28.4% paid at least 32%.

New Clients

In FY94, on the average, there were 959 new Home Care Program clients, 137 new Respite Care Program clients (including 96 new Respite Care only clients), 76 new ECOP clients, and 44 new MCIH clients per month. In total, there were 1,175 intakes per month, 83 more than FY93.

New Home Care Program clients constituted 3.1% of all Home Care Program clients. Among them, 24.5% were Medicaid eligible. New Respite Care Program clients constituted 10.0% of all Respite Care Program clients. Among them, 70.3% were Respite Care only clients. New ECOP clients constituted 8.1% of all ECOP clients. New MCIH clients constituted 4.8% of all MCIH clients.

The major referral sources for new Home Care Program clients were home health agencies (25.1%), relatives and friends (20.9%), and hospitals (18.3%). Relatives (37.7%) were the major referral source of new Respite Care Only clients. Home health agencies and hospitals referred 16.9% and 9.2% of new Respite Care only clients, respectively. The major referral sources for new MCIH and ECOP clients were hospitals and home health agencies.

In FY94, the Home Care Corporations served information and referral to 104,668 elders, a 16.4% increase from FY93.

Terminations

In FY94, on the average, 1,014 Home Care Program clients left the Home Care Program each month; 99 Respite Care Program clients left the Respite Care Program (including 78 Respite Care only clients); 73 ECOP clients left the Enhanced Community Option Program; and 45 MCIH clients left the Managed Care in Housing Program. The discontinuation rates were 3.3%, 7.2%, 7.8%, and 5.0% of Home Care Program clients, Respite Care Program clients, ECOP clients, and MCIH clients, respectively.

The major reasons of termination for Home Care Program were nursing home placement (29.7%), death (24.3%), adequate family/friend/agency support (8.7%), and moved from service area (6.3%). Institutionalization accounted for 29.7% of the terminations in the Home Care Program; 35.8% in the Respite Care program; 54.1% in the Managed Care in Housing program; and 37.5% in the Enhanced Community Option program. Death accounted for 24.3% of the terminations in the Home Care Program; 21.0% in the Respite Care Program; 19.0% in the MCIH; and 19.1% in the ECOP. Adequate family/agency support accounted for 8.7% of the terminations in the Home Care Program and 9.6% in the Respite Care Program.

Case Management

Based on the information provided by the 22 Home Care Corporations, the average caseload per case manager was 65 in FY94.

Service Utilization

Table 15 lists service utilization by program.

Table 15: Service Utilization by Program, FY94					
		Home Care	Respite Care	ECOP	MCIH
Homemaker	C	326,377	6,401	8,175	9,224
	U/C	14.0	14.8	-	-
Personal Care	C	77,664	2,854	4,951	6,129
	U/C	10.5	14.2	-	-
Heavy Chore	C	3,902	-	67	585
	U/C	4.7	-	-	-
Light Chore	C	12,651	-	112	86
	U/C	4.5	-	-	-
Transportation	C	56,955	769	2,654	1,942
	U/C	9.2	15.0	-	-
Laundry	C	12,407	-	244	676
	U/C	6.2	-	-	-
Home Delivered	C	106,058	279	3,350	3,455
Meals	U/C	24.6	21.7	-	-
Social Day	C	9,574	709	504	509
Care	U/C	10.6	10.5	-	-
Elder Service	C	9,177	-	1,277	83
Corps.	U/C	6.2	-	-	-
Companion	C	10,362	1,515	1,022	368
	U/C	8.7	23.5	-	-
Home Health	C	1,281	1,595	792	156
Aide	U/C	16.5	16.0	-	-
Nursing	C	1,262	279	382	417
Service	U/C	2.1	2.1	-	-
Therapy,	C	37	-	20	23
Physical	U/C	4.0	-	-	-
Adult Day	C	4,398	3,022	1,715	591
Health	U/C	11.6	9.4	-	-
Personal	C	9,942	-	1,297	5,405
Emergency	U/C	1.0	-	-	-
Shopping	C	11,399	-	316	873
	U/C	4.7	-	-	-
Alzheimer's	C	-	269	-	-
Day Care	U/C	-	9.2	-	-
Short-Term	C	-	83	-	-
Institution	U/C	-	10.4	-	-

C: Number of clients used the service in FY94
 U/C: Number of units per client a month
 Source: Home Care Monthly Statistics, Respite Care Monthly
 Statistics, Managed Care in Housing Monthly Statistics,
 Enhanced Community Option Program Monthly Statistics.

Appendix I: Clients by Age/Sex/Matrix

A. Home Care Clients

Age	<u>Critical</u>							
	FIL 1		FIL 2		FILE 3		FIL 4	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
60-64	17	35	70	218	166	391	36	58
65-69	30	112	143	482	305	834	73	164
70-74	47	162	193	864	461	1,447	110	334
75-79	76	246	239	1,165	485	2,170	97	448
80-84	86	249	291	1,557	584	2,898	93	542
85-89	61	257	262	1,392	454	2,445	73	373
90-94	39	168	158	803	209	1,289	31	116
95-99	13	58	33	204	50	218	3	16
100+	2	20	7	34	7	28	1	0
Total	371	1,307	1,396	6,719	2,721	11,720	517	2,051

Age	<u>Non-Critical</u>								<u>Exception</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	FIL 1		FIL 2		FIL 3		FIL 4					
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
64	3	10	4	17	5	39	4	19	0	4	305	791
69	7	11	12	46	25	106	17	67	1	0	613	1822
70-74	5	16	18	65	31	210	42	123	6	8	913	3,229
75-79	3	22	26	95	34	305	28	222	3	5	988	4,678
80-84	4	30	27	131	63	459	39	261	2	5	1,189	6,132
85-89	4	23	10	121	52	397	32	166	1	6	949	5,180
90-94	6	18	7	65	30	185	11	49	0	2	491	2,695
95-99	1	5	1	17	4	40	0	8	0	0	105	566
100+	1	2	0	2	0	5	0	1	0	0	18	92
Total	34	137	105	559	244	1746	173	916	13	30	5,571	25,185

B. Respite Care/Home Care Clients

	FIL 1		FIL 2		FIL 3		FIL 4		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
0-64	2	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	5
65-69	7	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	9	5
70-74	6	7	4	7	2	6	0	0	12	20
75-79	8	12	4	9	2	2	0	0	14	23
80-84	11	20	2	12	0	6	0	0	13	38
85-89	3	16	3	14	1	0	0	0	7	30
90-94	3	15	1	5	1	1	0	1	5	22
95-99	5	9	1	2	0	0	0	0	6	11
100+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Total	45	86	17	51	8	16	0	1	70	154

Appendix I: Clients by Age/Sex/Matrix (Continued)

C. Respite Care Only Clients

	FIL 1		FIL 2		FIL 3		FIL 4		TOTAL	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
60-64	7	20	9	7	4	7	0	0	20	34
65-69	27	23	16	21	6	6	0	1	51	50
70-74	51	69	36	33	13	9	0	0	100	111
75-79	76	71	54	42	24	27	0	1	154	141
80-84	51	63	46	32	23	23	0	0	120	111
85-89	38	42	30	37	13	12	0	0	81	91
90-94	14	32	14	15	4	8	0	0	33	55
95-99	1	9	3	2	0	1	0	0	4	12
100+	0	8	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	10
Total	265	337	209	189	88	95	0	2	565	622

D. Managed Care in Housing Clients

Age	Critical								Non-Critical		Total	
	FIL 1		FIL 2		FILE 3		FIL 4					
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
0-64	1	2	2	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	6	7
65-69	7	2	9	10	0	4	0	0	0	1	16	17
70-74	2	9	9	30	3	13	0	0	0	1	14	53
75-79	2	12	21	51	5	39	0	0	0	1	28	103
80-84	8	16	22	112	10	64	0	0	1	1	41	183
85-89	4	18	19	91	9	62	1	0	1	2	34	173
90-94	1	18	21	96	8	35	0	0	0	1	30	150
95-99	0	2	6	23	0	7	0	0	0	0	6	32
100+	0	2	6	23	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	0
Total	25	79	110	416	38	226	1	0	2	7	176	728

E. Enhanced Community Option Program Clients

Age	Critical								Non-Critical		Total	
	FIL 1		FIL 2		FILE 3		FIL 4					
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
60-64	2	6	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	9
65-69	6	13	3	16	4	8	3	0	1	0	8	12
70-74	14	34	9	24	3	8	1	1	4	5	16	38
75-79	14	51	14	46	5	13	0	0	2	3	31	72
80-84	24	68	33	69	13	26	1	1	1	4	35	113
85-89	11	57	21	72	9	27	1	0	2	6	72	168
90-94	8	41	11	50	4	20	0	0	0	3	44	162
95-99	4	12	5	14	0	3	0	0	1	0	23	114
100+	0	4	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	30
Total	83	286	101	301	40	106	6	2	11	21	239	718

Appendix I: Clients by Age/Sex/Matrix (Continued)

F. Protective Service Clients

Age	Protective Service/ Home Care		Respite		MCIH		ECOP		Protective Only		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
60-64	4	7	2	3	0	0	0	0	8	29	14	39
65-69	2	13	0	6	0	0	0	2	12	39	14	60
70-74	6	31	1	3	0	0	0	0	18	52	25	86
75-79	8	36	2	4	1	0	1	3	24	63	36	106
80-84	15	29	0	7	0	2	0	2	26	54	41	94
85-89	5	31	2	6	0	0	0	3	16	33	23	73
90-94	5	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	12	15	26
95-99	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	1	13
100+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total	46	163	7	29	1	2	3	12	112	293	169	499

Appendix II: Clients by Medicaid Type, Marital Status, Living Arrangement, and Minority Groups

A. Home Care Clients

Table 2
Medicaid

2176 Waiver	2,712
Spousal	470
Non-Spouse	2,201
Other	8,277
Total	11,186

Table 3
Marital Status

Single	3,738
Married	4,043
Widowed	19,943
Divorced	2,340
Separated	692
Total	30,756

Table 4
Living Arrangement

Alone	23,734
Spouse	3,303
Spouse/Family	289
Family	2,952
Non-Family	473
Family/Non-Family	5
Total	30,756

Table 5
Minority

Cape Verdean	94
Black	1,613
Hispanic	478
Native American	24
Asian	261
Total	2,470

B. Home Care and Respite Care Clients

Table 2
Marital Status

Single	12
Married	103
Widowed	100
Divorced	5
Separated	4
Total	224

Table 3
Living Arrangement

Alone	28
Spouse	93
Spouse/Family	10
Family	88
Non-Family	5
Family/Non-Family	0
Total	224

Table 4
Minority

Cape Verdean	2
Black	26
Hispanic	4
Native American	0
Asian	0
Total	32

C. Respite Care Only Clients

Table 2
Marital Status

Single	54
Married	881
Widowed	230
Divorced	17
Separated	5
Total	1,187

Table 3
Living Arrangement

Alone	25
Spouse	837
Spouse/Family	63
Family	247
Non-Family	13
Family/Non-Family	2
Total	1,187

Table 4
Minority

Cape Verdean	1
Black	37
Hispanic	6
Native American	1
Asian	1
Total	46

Appendix II: Clients by Medicaid Type, Marital Status, Living Arrangement, and Minority Groups

D. Managed Care in Housing Clients

Table 2
Marital Status

Single	120
Married	84
Widowed	649
Divorced	42
Separated	9
Total	904

Table 3
Living Arrangement

Alone	792
Spouse	70
Spouse/Family	0
Family	25
Non-Family	15
Family/Non-Family	2
Total	904

Table 4
Minority

Cape Verdean	1
Black	22
Hispanic	1
Native American	1
Asian	0
Total	25

E. Enhanced Community Option Program Clients*

Table 2
Marital Status

Single	93
Married	212
Widowed	617
Divorced	29
Separated	6
Total	957

Table 3
Living Arrangement

Alone	507
Spouse	177
Spouse/Family	18
Family	234
Non-Family	19
Family/Non-Family	2
Total	957

Table 4
Minority

Cape Verdean	1
Black	25
Hispanic	2
Native American	0
Asian	4
Total	32

Appendix III: Clients by Housing Development

A. Home Care Clients

Housing Types	Critical FIL 1	FIL 2	FIL 3	FIL 4
Boarding Home	9	24	28	7
Congregate Subsidy	5	100	261	36
Hotel/Single Room	1	2	0	0
Housing Authority	264	2,031	4,420	892
Other Private	9	22	30	7
Other Subsidized Bldg	161	1,336	2,870	650
Other Subsidized	3	34	42	2
Own Home	602	2,192	3,128	434
Private Home	322	831	961	86
Rent Sub/Private	97	559	1,252	236
Rental House/Apt	202	919	1,462	217
Rooming House	1	3	6	1
Total	1,676	8,053	14,460	2,568

Housing Types	Non-Critical FIL 1	FIL 2	FIL 3	FIL 4	Exception	Total
Boarding Home	0	9	3	1	0	81
Congregate Subsidy	0	2	14	8	3	429
Hotel/Single Room	0	0	0	0	0	3
Housing Authority	16	150	600	358	11	8,742
Other Private	3	0	5	1	15	92
Other Subsidized Bldg	13	100	405	266	4	5,805
Other Subsidized	0	1	10	6	0	98
Own Home	71	187	414	194	4	7,271
Private Home	35	84	158	54	2	2,533
Rent Subsidized/Private	13	51	152	99	3	2,462
Rental House/Apt	19	80	227	80	1	3,228
Rooming House	0	0	0	1	0	12
Total	170	664	1,988	1,068	43	30,756

Appendix III: Clients by Housing Development (Continued)

B. Respite Care/Home Care Clients

Housing Types	FIL 1	FIL 2	FIL 3	FIL 4	Total
Boarding Home	0	0	0	0	0
Congregate Subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
Hotel/Single Room	0	0	0	0	0
Housing Authority	4	8	5	0	17
Other Private	0	0	0	0	0
Other Sub Bldg	9	4	3	0	16
Other Subsidized	2	0	0	0	2
Own Home	48	25	9	0	82
Private Home	37	19	3	0	59
Rent Sub/Private	10	4	1	0	15
Rental House/Apt	21	8	3	1	33
Rooming House	0	0	0	0	0
Total	131	68	24	1	224

C. Respite Care Only Clients

Housing Types	FIL 1	FIL 2	FIL 3	FIL 4	Total
Boarding Home	0	0	0	0	0
Congregate Subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
Hotel/Single Room	0	0	0	0	0
Housing Authority	17	13	7	1	38
Other Private	2	2	1	0	5
Other Subsidized Bldg	35	23	18	0	76
Other Subsidized	1	1	0	1	3
Own Home	388	232	101	0	721
Private Home	94	59	31	0	184
Rent Sub/Private	13	11	4	0	28
Rental House/Apt	56	56	19	1	132
Rooming House	0	0	0	0	0
Total	606	397	181	3	1,187

Appendix III: Clients by Housing Development (Continued)

D. Managed Care in Housing Clients*

Housing Types	Critical				Non- Critical	Total
	FIL 1	FIL 2	FILE 3	FIL 4		
Boarding Home	0	2	0	0	0	2
Congregate Sub	2	29	13	1	0	45
Hotel/Single Room	0	0	0	0	0	0
Housing Authority	38	239	131	1	4	413
Other Private	0	0	1	0	0	1
Other Sub Bldg	32	179	90	0	0	306
Other Subsidized	0	0	2	0	5	2
Own Home	8	21	10	0	0	39
Private Home	3	9	2	0	0	14
Rent Sub/Private	13	43	15	0	0	71
Rental House/Apt	3	4	4	0	0	11
Rooming House	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	99	526	268	2	9	904

E. Enhanced Community Option Program Clients*

Housing Types	Critical				Non- Critical	Total
	FIL 1	FIL 2	FILE 3	FIL 4		
Boarding Home	4	0	0	0	0	4
Congregate Subsidy	1	2	3	0	1	7
Hotel/Single Room	0	0	0	0	0	0
Housing Authority	12	44	27	3	0	86
Other Private	2	0	1	0	0	3
Other Sub Bldg	10	49	20	1	1	81
Other Subsidized	0	0	0	0	1	1
Own Home	195	173	62	1	19	450
Private Home	93	66	6	0	7	172
Rent Sub/Priv	11	24	7	0	1	43
Rental House/Apt	38	50	17	2	3	110
Rooming House	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	366	408	143	7	33	957

Appendix IV: Income

A. Home Care Clients

Single Households		Two Person Households	
MEDICAID	10,272	MEDICAID	878
<7,232 NONMEDICAID	2,530	<9,695 NONMEDICAID	280
7,232- 8,821	4,960	9,695-12,160	321
8,822-10,410	4,700	12,161-14,612	628
10,411-11,496	1,829	14,613-15,850	273
11,497-12,319	1,023	15,851-17,085	294
12,320-13,140	767	17,086-18,321	182
13,141-13,960	546	18,322-19,557	154
13,961-14,782	385	19,558-20,792	158
14,783-15,601	243	20,793-22,029	81
15,602-16,442	138	22,030-23,266	31
16,442+	71	23,266+	1
Income Unknown	8	Income Unknown	3
<hr/>		<hr/>	
<u>Total</u>	27,472	<u>Total</u>	3,284
		<u>Grand Total</u>	30,756

B/C: Respite Care

	2-PERSON UNIT		3-PERSON UNIT		4-PERSON UNIT	
	RC/HC	RC Only	RC/HC	RC Only	RC/HC	RC Only
3%	66	276	6	5	0	1
5%	14	63	1	2	0	0
7%	18	68	0	2	0	0
9%	15	59	0	4	0	0
11%	4	65	0	3	0	0
13%	9	65	0	1	0	0
15%	4	59	0	3	0	0
17%	3	52	1	1	0	0
20%	1	54	1	2	0	2
22%	3	51	0	1	0	0
27%	2	37	1	4	0	0
32%	2	49	1	1	0	0
37%	3	27	1	4	0	0
42%	0	29	1	0	0	0
47%	1	9	0	1	0	0
52%	2	26	0	1	0	0
57%	0	9	0	0	0	0
63%	1	9	0	1	0	0
68%	0	9	0	1	0	0
73%	0	6	0	1	0	0
78%	0	8	0	0	0	0
83%	0	3	1	1	0	0
88%	1	7	0	0	0	0
93%	0	0	0	0	0	0
98%	1	5	0	1	0	0
100%	7	14	2	15	0	1
<hr/>						
Total	205	1,125	19	58	0	4

Appendix IV: Income (continued)

D. Managed Care in Housing Clients*

Single Households		Two Person Households	
<7,232 NONMEDICAID	114	<9,695 NONMEDICAID	3
7,232- 8,821	243	9,695-12,160	10
8,822-10,410	267	12,161-14,612	23
10,411-11,496	84	14,613-15,850	9
11,497-12,319	39	15,851-17,085	5
12,320-13,140	29	17,086-18,321	6
13,141-13,960	21	18,322-19,557	2
13,961-14,782	17	19,558-20,792	6
14,783-15,601	12	20,793-22,029	5
15,602-16,442	5	22,030-23,266	1
16,442+	2	23,266+	0
Income Unknown	0	Income Unknown	0
<hr/>		<hr/>	
<u>Total</u>	834	<u>Total</u>	70
		<u>Grand Total</u>	904

E. Enhanced Community Option Program

Single Households		Two Person Households	
<7,232 NONMEDICAID	84	<9,695 NONMEDICAID	17
7,232- 8,821	198	9,695-12,160	13
8,822-10,410	197	12,161-14,612	36
10,411-11,496	94	14,613-15,850	33
11,497-12,319	42	15,851-17,085	26
12,320-13,140	46	17,086-18,321	24
13,141-13,960	32	18,322-19,557	17
13,961-14,782	19	19,558-20,792	17
14,783-15,601	27	20,793-22,029	8
15,602-16,442	10	22,030-23,266	9
16,442+	4	23,266+	2
Income Unknown	2	Income Unknown	0
<hr/>		<hr/>	
<u>Total</u>	755	<u>Total</u>	202
		<u>Grand Total</u>	957

ACME
BOOKBINDING CO., INC.

DEC 02 1999

100 CAMBRIDGE STREET
CHARLESTOWN, MASS.

